

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of	:	Customer Number: 20277
	:	
Craig HANSEN, et al.	:	Confirmation Number: 5073
	:	
Application No.: 10/757,851	:	Group Art Unit: 2183
	:	
Filed: January 16, 2004	:	Examiner: COLEMAN, ERIC
	:	
For: METHOD AND SOFTWARE FOR PARTITIONED FLOATING-POINT MULTIPLY- ADD OPERATION		

**INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Mail Stop Petition  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.56, 1.97 and 1.98, the attention of the Patent and Trademark Office is hereby directed to the documents listed on the attached form PTO-1449. It is respectfully requested that the documents be expressly considered during the prosecution of this application.

This Information Disclosure Statement is being filed before the mailing of a first office action after the filing of a request for continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 pending a petition to withdraw from issue after payment of the issue fee. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(b)(4). No certification or fee is required.

The instant filing is submitted to bring to the Examiner's attention a recent office action issued in copending Reexamination Control No. 95/000,089 (identified as "6,643,765 (Control No.

95/000,089) Right of Appeal Notice (37 CFR 1.953) mailed November 5, 2008”), together with Patent Owner’s Request for Reconsideration and Response and Objection to the Right of Appeal Notice. The Right of Appeal Notice and the Response address the ability of the claims of the ‘765 patent to receive the priority date of earlier filed applications from which it claims priority, and in particular, the status of the ‘599 appendix as part of the ‘599 disclosure.<sup>1</sup>

Applicants note that in the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner directly addressed the issue of, and confirmed, this application’s claim of priority to the ‘840 patent (filed Aug. 16, 1995) via the ‘599 patent, resulting in the withdrawal of rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of, *inter alia*, Fisher (which claimed an effective filing date of Sep. 5, 1995). Specifically, pages 10-11 of the Office Action mailed on Feb. 21, 2007 asserted that “the priority for the claimed invention does not extend to the ‘599 or the ‘840 patents.” In the subsequent Amendment filed August 21, 2007, “Applicants respectfully traverse[d] the pending § 103 rejections . . . because none of [the] cited references qualifies as prior art against the present invention” because of the priority claim, treating the ‘599 appendix as part of the ‘599 disclosure. The following Office Action mailed on May 9, 2008 accordingly withdrew the rejections under Section 103.

---

<sup>1</sup> Other Patent Office correspondence in copending applications and reexaminations is submitted as well.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Eric M. Shelton

Registration No. 57,630

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 EMS:MWE  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: December 15, 2008**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**